

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 5, 10, 17 and 22 are amended. Claim 11 is canceled. No claims are added. Claims 1-10 and 12-27 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 102**Claims 1-9**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Neibauer (The ABCs of WordPerfect 8, published in 1997), hereinafter "Neibauer." Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites, "a highlight rendering services component" in an electronic document editor. The highlight rendering services component comprises "a highlight rendering services interface that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension to highlight a section of an electronic document." Claim 1 also recites that the editor extension determines "a visual aspect of the highlight" and the highlight rendering services component determines "non-visual functional aspects of the highlight."

Neibauer is a reference guide for using a document editor. Specifically, the cited excerpt provides instructions on editing a document.

Neibauer does not disclose or anticipate several features included in claim 1. For one, claim 1 recites that a highlight rendering service provides one or more methods for use by an editor extension. Therefore, an electronic document editor as recited in claim 1 must be extensible, i.e. certain features of the electronic document editor may be customized by a user. This is not the case with WordPerfect as described in Niebauer. WordPerfect does not provide an

1 extensible editor. It merely provides an editor that can be used to edit electronic
2 documents.

3 Furthermore, the amendment to claim 1 particularly points out that the
4 editor extension determines a visual aspect of a highlight while the highlight
5 renderings services component determines other functional aspects of the
6 highlight. Visual aspects of a highlight controlled by an editor extension include
7 background and/or text color, scroll position, selection state, etc.. Other functional
8 aspects that are controlled by the highlight rendering services component include
9 cursor position, cursor movement, mouse actions, etc.

10 By separating the visual appearance from other functions, an editor
11 extension can be developed without regard for the inner processing that takes place
12 during a highlight selection process. The extension only has to deal with the
13 appearance of the highlight. Such efficiency cannot be achieved with the systems
14 and/or methods disclosed in Niebauer.

15 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Neibauer and the rejection should be
16 withdrawn.

17 Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of that
18 dependency. In addition, claim 5 has been amended to clarify that a first extension
19 can be replaced with a second extension to alter the appearance of a highlight
20 selection. For this additional reason, claim 5 is allowable over the cited
21 referenced.

1 **35 U.S.C. § 103**

2 **Claims 10-27**

3 Claims 10-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable
4 over Neibauer in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,480,206 to Prinzing, hereinafter
5 “Prinzing.” Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

6 Prinzing describes a modular text editor that formats and displays text by
7 creating style objects that format text elements arranged hierarchically. Style
8 objects include formatting information for document text elements, paragraph text
9 elements, and character text elements. The editor also provides view objects to
10 display text elements of the document. Using information associated with the style
11 objects, the formatted text elements in the document are displayed using the view
12 objects.

13 **Claim 10** has been amended to recite one or more computer-readable media
14 having computer-executable instructions for one or more interfaces that, when
15 executed “by an electronic document editor” on a computer, perform the following
16 steps: “receiving parameters from a designer through a highlight rendering
17 services interface;” “utilizing the parameters to highlight a segment of an
18 electronic document *with particular highlight visual aspects*,” and “returning
19 values to the designer regarding the state of the highlighted segment.”
20 (Amendment emphasized).

21 Prinzing basically describes plug-in fonts using a method to correlate a type
22 of style object with a particular view object. Style objects define text elements
23 while view objects define how the text elements are displayed.

24 Initially, it is noted that neither Niebauer nor Prinzing make reference to an
25 extensible highlight rendering function. Niebauer merely describes a highlighting

1 function in an electronic document editor and Prinzing does not relate to
2 highlighting at all. This alone is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claim 10.

3 However, it is also noted that Prinzing does not recite "receiving parameters
4 from a designer through a highlight rendering services interface," "utilizing the
5 parameters to highlight a segment of an electronic document with particular
6 highlight visual aspects," and "returning values to the designer regarding the state
7 of the highlighted segment. Prinzing merely describes associated display attributes
8 with style attributes associated with particular text elements.

9 Neither reference nor a combination of the two teaches or anticipates each
10 and every element recited in claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable over the
11 cited references and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

12 Claim 11 has been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

13 Claims 12-16 depend from claim 10 and are allowable at least by virtue of
14 that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

15 Claim 17 recites a "method for providing highlight rendering services to
16 one or more extensions in an extensible editor." The method comprises "receiving
17 a request from an extension to utilize the highlight rendering services,"
18 "facilitating the request by presenting a highlight rendering services interface that
19 is accessible by the extension" and "communicating with the extension through the
20 highlight rendering services interface to enable the extension to highlight a section
21 of a document through the editor according to particular display attributes defined
22 by the extension."

23 Neither Niebauer nor Prinzing teach or suggest the highlight rendering
24 services recited in claim 17. For this reason and other set forth in the response to
25

1 the rejection of claim 10, above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited references.

2 Accordingly, the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

3 **Claims 18-21** depend from claim 17 and are allowable at least by virtue of
4 that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

5 **Claim 22** recites an "electronic document editor stored on a computer-
6 readable medium." The electronic document editor comprises "a designer
7 interface to transfer data between the editor and one or more designers attached to
8 the editor, "an event routing controller to route events received by the editor to the
9 one or more designers" and "a highlight rendering services component that is
10 configured to enable a designer to modify rendered character attributes of
11 highlighted document text without modifying the document content."

12 As previously discussed, neither Niebauer nor Prinzing teach or suggest an
13 extensible editor that provides for editor extensions to modify rendered character
14 attributes of *highlighted* text. Furthermore, claim 22 requires that the rendered
15 character attributes of highlighted document text can be modified by an editor
16 extension without modifying the document content. There is no indication that
17 Prinzing describes such a feature. In fact, in typical extensible editors as described
18 in Prinzing, the display attributes of characters are stored with an electronic
19 document, which contradicts this particular element of claim 22. According to
20 claim 22, the character attributes are modified only temporarily, as would be
21 expected with a highlighting function.

22 Accordingly, claim 22 is allowable over the cited references and the
23 rejection should be withdrawn.

24 **Claim 23-27** depend from claim 22 and are allowable at least by virtue of
25 that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

C. nclusion

All pending claims 1-10 and 12-27 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 5/4/04By: Nathan R. Rieth

Nathan R. Rieth

Reg. No. 44,302

(509) 324-9256x233